



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/681,051	10/07/2003	Simon Gibson	AOL0108	6023

22862 7590 12/12/2007
GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER

MOUZON, LAJUANIA N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/12/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/681,051

Applicant(s)

GIBSON ET AL.

Examiner

La Juania N. Mouzon

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is in response to Applicant's Amendment filed 10/29/2007.

Claims 1-43 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1, 10, 11, 17, 26, 27 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The original specification as filed does not disclose or support the selection of a web server. The Examiner notes the specification does disclose the selection or the determination of a preferred mirror instance (**pg. 7 line(s) 15-20**). Furthermore, the specification discloses having a web server, not a plurality of web servers that may lead to the selection of a selected web server. Therefore the selected web server as claimed introduces "new matter".

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The Examiner notes that on pg. 9 line(s) 1 that reference numbers 12 and 22 both refer to a network, wherein only number 22 is a network. Suggested correction remove #22.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 1, 17, and 31 objected to because of the following informalities: claim 1 line(s) 8 should read ... "the selected **web** server..." The same follows for claim 17 line(s) 29 and claim 31 line(s) 38.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-20, 22-23, 26, 28-37, 40, 42, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Joffe et al. (US 6,185,619).

8. In regards to claim 1 Joffe et al. discloses, a process implemented across a network for providing a link to a preferred network server corresponding to a preferred

Art Unit: 2153

mirror instance within a plurality of network servers corresponding to a plurality of mirror instances of a content store, comprising the steps of:

- a. providing a server application (**Fig. 4A #360**) at a selected web server (**Fig. 4A #212**), and a client application at a client terminal (**Fig. 4A World Wide Web Browser residing on a client terminal.**),
 - i. the selected server (**Fig. 4A #212**) comprising a server other than a server corresponding to the content store (**Fig. 4A #232 (another server), #368 (content store) and Col. 10 line(s) 4-9**) and the network servers (**Fig. 4A #250**) corresponding to the mirror instances (**Fig. 4A #232**),
 - ii. wherein the client terminal is connected to the selected web server by a first connection (**Fig. 4A #410**), wherein the client terminal is connected to the network through the selected web server (**Fig. 4A #412**), and wherein the server application and the client application are integrated to provide localization decisions invisibly to a user, and to provide links to localized content from the server application to the client application (**Col. 13 line(s) 10-12 and 37-41, teach the front end software component (server application #360) and the client application (WWW Browser) working together (integrated) invisibly to the user, by the server application receiving a request from the client, to decide the best content server to direct the client to (providing localization**

decision). Then providing a link to the WWW Browser via the front end software component of the best content server.);

b. determining localization information for each mirrored instance of the content store, wherein the localization information comprises the number of hops and latency from each mirrored instance of the content store to any of the selected web server and the client terminal **(Col. 11 line(s) 43-55 and Col. 12 line(s) 20-23, teach the director making decisions about which content server is best for each request by a client using localization information, including the ICMP echo response times (latency) and currently open TCP connections (# of hops) from each content server (mirror instance) to the web server and client.);**

c. storing the determined localization information in a localization database **(Col. 12 line(s) 16-19 and Col. 15 line(s) 30-48, teach the localization information being stored and retrieved from the stored location based on a request. Therefore it is inherent that the stored location is a database.);**

d. sending a request to the selected web server over the first connection from a user at the client terminal **(Fig. 4A #410 and Col. 13 line(s) 1-2.), the request comprising a link to mirrored content (Col. 13 line(s) 10-12, teach the request having a link to mirrored content.);**

e. querying the localization database and applying a set of rules to the stored localization information through the server application at the selected web server

Art Unit: 2153

to determine a preferred mirror instance for the client terminal, the rules comprising a function of the stored hop information and the stored latency information between each of the mirror instances and the client terminal (**Fig. 5A and 5B, Col. 11 line(s) 43-52, Col. 14 line(s) 64-67 – Col. 15 line(s) 1-2, teach the director receiving a query request from the front-end component (server application), at the web server (front end server #212). Then applying a statistical algorithm (set of rules) to determine the “best” server (mirror instance), wherein the rules are a function of the stored hop and latency information between each of the mirror instances and the client terminal.);**

f. dynamically generating a localized link to the determined preferred mirror instance through the server application at the selected web server (**Col. 13 line(s) 34-39, teach dynamically generating a localized link to the determined preferred mirror instance through the server application at the selected web server.); and**

g. transmitting the localized link from the selected web server to the client terminal (**Col. 13 line(s) 37-41, teach sending the localized link from the web server to the client.);**

9. In regards to claims 2, 18, and 32 Joffe et al. discloses, automatically directing the user to the local mirror instance when the user selects the localized link (**Fig. 4A**

#420 and Col. 13 line(s) 42-46, teach the client selecting the link and being automatically directed to the local mirror.).

10. In regards to claims 3, 19, and 33 Joffe et al. discloses, wherein the function of the stored hop information and the stored latency information between each of the mirror instances and the client terminal comprises a determination of a mirror instance having the lowest number of hops (**Col. 11 line(s) 45-50 and Col. 12 line(s) 20-23, teach the director using the number of hops to decide which content server (mirror instance) is the best one.).**

11. In regards to claims 4, 20, and 34 Joffe et al. discloses, wherein the function of the stored hop information and the stored latency information between each of the mirror instances and the client terminal comprises a determination of one or more mirror instances having the lowest number of hops, and in the case of a tie, the preferred mirror instance additionally comprises the lowest latency (**Col. 14 line(s) 55-63, teach that the mirror instance is chosen base on the number of hops and if there is a tie then the one with the lowest latency wins.).**

12. In regards to claims 6, 22, and 36 Joffe et al. discloses, where in the localization information further comprises mirror server load information (**Col. 12 line(s) 16-23, teach the localization information including the content server (mirror instance) load.).**

13. In regards to claims 7, 23, and 37 Joffe et al. discloses, wherein the localization information further comprises mirror server operation information (**Col. 11 line(s) 46-47**

and Col. 12 line(s) 16-23, teach the localization information including the replicated server status and other operation information (mirror instance operation information).).

14. In regards to claims 10 and 26 Joffe et al. discloses, wherein the selected web server is associated with a service provider **(Col. 11 line(s) 27-40, teach the front end server (web server) being associated with a service provider.).**

15. In regards to claims 12, 28, and 42 Joffe et al. discloses, wherein the request comprises a web page **(Col. 13 line(s) 1-2, teach the request being a HTTP request from a web browser, i.e. a web page.).**

16. In regards to claims 13, 29, and 43 Joffe et al. discloses, wherein the localized link is included within a webpage, and wherein the webpage is transmitted to the client terminal **(Col. 13 line(s) 37-39, teach the link being in a HTTP reply (web page) and transferring it to the client terminal.).**

17. In regards to claim 14 Joffe et al. discloses, wherein the preferred mirror is further determined from the request IP address of the client terminal **(Col. 11 line(s) 43-46, teach that the request IP address of the client terminal is taken into consideration when determining the best content server (preferred mirror).).**

18. In regards to claims 15 and 30 Joffe et al. discloses, wherein the preferred mirror is further determined from the request IP network of the user **(Col. 11 line(s) 45-47, teach the preferred mirror (content server) being determined from the request IP network of the user.).**

19. In regards to claim 16 Joffe et al. discloses wherein the localized link comprises an HTTP link **(Col. 13 line(s) 1-2, teach the request being a HTTP request from a web browser, i.e. a web page.)**.

20. In regards to claim 17 Joffe et al. discloses, a process implemented across a network for providing a link to a preferred network server corresponding to a preferred mirror instance within a plurality of network servers corresponding to a plurality of mirror instances of a content store, comprising the steps of:

h. providing a server application **(Fig. 4A #360)** at a selected web server **(Fig. 4A #212)**, and a client application at a client terminal **(Fig. 4A World Wide Web Browser residing on a client terminal.)**,

iii. the selected server **(Fig. 4A #212)** comprising a server other than a server corresponding to the content store **(Fig. 4A #232 (another server), #368 (content store) and Col. 10 line(s) 4-9)** and the network servers **(Fig. 4A #250)** corresponding to the mirror instances **(Fig. 4A #232)**,

iv. wherein the client terminal is connected to the selected web server by a first connection **(Fig. 4A #410)**, wherein the client terminal is connected to the network through the selected web server **(Fig. 4A #412)**, and wherein the server application and the client application are integrated to provide localization decisions invisibly to a user, and to provide links to localized content from the server application to the client application **(Col. 13 line(s) 10-12 and 37-41, teach the front end software component**

(server application #360) and the client application (WWW Browser) working together (integrated) invisibly to the user, by the server application receiving a request from the client, to decide the best content server to direct the client to (providing localization decision). Then providing a link to the WWW Browser via the front end software component of the best content server.);

- i. **determining localization information for each mirrored instance of the content store, wherein the localization information comprises the number of hops and latency from each mirrored instance of the content store to any of the selected web server and the client terminal (Col. 11 line(s) 43-55 and Col. 12 line(s) 20-23, teach the director making decisions about which content server is best for each request by a client using localization information, including the ICMP echo response times (latency) and currently open TCP connections (# of hops) from each content server (mirror instance) to the web server and client.);**
- j. **storing the determined localization information in a localization database (Col. 12 line(s) 16-19 and Col. 15 line(s) 30-48, teach the localization information being stored and retrieved from the stored location based on a request. Therefore it is inherent that the stored location is a database.);**
- k. **sending a request to the selected web server over the first connection from a user at the client terminal (Fig. 4A #410 and Col. 13 line(s) 1-2.), the**

request comprising a link to mirrored content (**Col. 13 line(s) 10-12, teach the request having a link to mirrored content.**);

l. querying the localization database and applying a set of rules to the stored localization information through the server application at the selected web server to determine a preferred mirror instance for the client terminal, the rules comprising a function of the stored hop information and the stored latency information between each of the mirror instances and the client terminal (**Fig. 5A and 5B, Col. 11 line(s) 43-52, Col. 14 line(s) 64-67 – Col. 15 line(s) 1-2, teach the director receiving a query request from the front-end component (server application), at the web server (front end server #212). Then applying a statistical algorithm (set of rules) to determine the “best” server (mirror instance), wherein the rules are a function of the stored hop and latency information between each of the mirror instances and the client terminal.**);

m. dynamically generating a localized link to the determined preferred mirror instance through the server application at the selected web server (**Col. 13 line(s) 34-39, teach dynamically generating a localized link to the determined preferred mirror instance through the server application at the selected web server.**); and

n. transmitting the localized link from the selected web server to the client terminal **(Col. 13 line(s) 37-41, teach sending the localized link from the web server to the client.)**.

21. In regards to claim 31 Joffe et al. discloses, a proximity resource allocation system implemented across a network for providing a link to a preferred network server within a plurality of network servers corresponding to a plurality of mirror instances of a content store from which a user terminal having a unique address is connectable to the preferred network server, comprising:

o. providing a server application **(Fig. 4A #360)** at a selected web server **(Fig. 4A #212)**, and a client application at a client terminal **(Fig. 4A World Wide Web Browser residing on a client terminal.)**,

v. the selected server **(Fig. 4A #212)** comprising a server other than a server corresponding to the content store **(Fig. 4A #232 (another server), #368 (content store) and Col. 10 line(s) 4-9)** and the network servers **(Fig. 4A #250)** corresponding to the mirror instances **(Fig. 4A #232)**,

vi. wherein the client terminal is connected to the selected web server by a first connection **(Fig. 4A #410)**, wherein the client terminal is connected to the network through the selected web server **(Fig. 4A #412)**, and wherein the server application and the client application are integrated to provide localization decisions invisibly to a user, and to provide links to

localized content from the server application to the client application (**Col. 13 line(s) 10-12 and 37-41, teach the front end software component (server application #360) and the client application (WWW Browser) working together (integrated) invisibly to the user, by the server application receiving a request from the client, to decide the best content server to direct the client to (providing localization decision). Then providing a link to the WWW Browser via the front end software component of the best content server.);**

p. a localization database comprising storage of localization information for each mirror of the content store (**Col. 12 line(s) 16-19 and Col. 15 line(s) 30-48, teach the localization information being stored and retrieved from the stored location based on a request. Therefore it is inherent that the stored location is a database.**), wherein the localization information comprises the number of hops and latency from each of the plurality mirrors to any of the selected web server and the user terminal (**Col. 16 line(s) 57-64, teach the director retrieving information that was stored by the Load Manager and Ping Manager. This information including the ICMP echo response time (latency) and currently open TCP connections (# of hops) as explained in Col. 11. line(s) 66-67 - Col. 12 line(s) 1-7 and 16-23);**

q. the server application for receiving a request sent to the selected web server over the first connection from the user terminal (**Fig. 4A #410 and Col. 13**

line(s) 10-11.), the request comprising a link to the content store (Col. 13 line(s) 10-12, teach the request having a link to mirrored content.), for

- vii. querying the localization database and applying a set of rules to the stored localization information through the server application at the Selected web server to determine a preferred mirror for the user terminal, wherein the determination is invisible to the user terminal, the rules comprising, a function of the stored hop information and the stored latency information between each of the mirrors and the unique address (**Fig. 5A and 5B, Col. 11 line(s) 43-52, Col. 14 line(s) 64-67 – Col. 15 line(s) 1-2, teach the director receiving a query request from the front-end component (server application), at the web server (front end server #212). Then applying a statistical algorithm (set of rules) to determine the “best” server (mirror instance), wherein the rules are a function of the stored hop and latency information between each of the mirror instances and the client terminal.), for**
- viii. dynamically generating a localized link to the determined preferred mirror through the server application at the selected web server (**Col. 13 line(s) 34-39, teach dynamically generating a localized link to the determined preferred mirror instance through the server application at the selected web server.), and for**

ix. transmitting the localized link from the selected web server to the user terminal (**Col. 13 line(s) 37-41, teach sending the localized link from the web server to the client.**).

22. In regards to claim 35 Joffe et al. discloses, wherein the unique address comprises a terminal IP address (**Col. 11 line(s) 45-46, teach the client terminal having a unique IP address.**).

23. In regards to claim 40 Joffe et al. discloses wherein the localization information comprises a map of all IP address space within a global routing table (**Col. 10 line(s) 65-67 – Col. 11 line(s) 1-4 and Col. 16 line(s) 62-64, teach the localization information in a global routing table mapping all of the IP address spaces.**).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

24. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

25. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 2153

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

26. Claims 5, 8, 21, 24, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joffe et al. (US 6,185,619) as applied to claims 1, 17, and 31 above, and further in view of Farber et al (US 6,185,598).

27. In regards to claims 5 and 21 Joffe et al. do not teach wherein the localization information further comprises a transmission cost for each mirrored instance of the content store to each network from which users connect.

28. In the same field of endeavor Farber et al. teach receiving a request from a client and locating the closest mirror instance (repeater) using localization information. The information including transmission cost for each mirrored instance of the content store to each network from which users connect (**Col. 11 line(s) 28-37 and Col. 13 line(s) 1-6 and 56-62**).

29. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Joffe et al. method and apparatus for balancing the process load on network servers according to network and server based policies with Farber et al. teaching as discussed above to allow for the capability of transmitting

Art Unit: 2153

the requested information the most cost efficient way, between the client and content server (mirror server/reflector).

30. In regards to claims 8, 24, and 38 Joffe et al. do not teach wherein the localization information further comprises cost information.

31. In the same field of endeavor Farber et al. teach receiving a request from a client and locating the closest mirror instance (repeater) using localization information. The information including cost information for each mirrored instance of the content store to each network from which users connect (**Col. 11 line(s) 18-22 and 28-37 and Col. 13 line(s) 1-6 and 56-62**).

32. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Joffe et al. method and apparatus for balancing the process load on network servers according to network and server based policies with Farber et al. teaching as discussed above to allow for the capability of transmitting the requested information the most cost efficient way, between the client and content server (mirror server/reflector).

33. Claims 9, 25, and 39 and rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joffe et al. (US 6,185,619), as applied to claims 1, 17, and 31 above, and further in view of Swilden et al. (PGPub 2002/0052942).

34. In regards to claims 9, 25, and 39 Joffe et al. do not teach wherein the localization information further comprises network segment information.

35. In the same field of endeavor Swildens et al. teach receiving a request from a client and determining the closest mirror site to direct it to using localization information. The localization information including network health (network segment) information **(¶0040)**.

36. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Joffe et al. method and apparatus for balancing the process load on network servers according to network and server based policies with Swildens et al. teaching as discussed above to allow for the capability of determining the optimal customer origin site.

37. Claims 11 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joffe et al. (US 6,185,619), as applied to claims 1, 17, and 31 above.

38. In regards to claims 11 and 27 Joffe et al. discloses the localization information is stored at the selected web server **(Fig. 4B #212 and Col. 11 line(s) 43-55, teach the director using the stored localization information on the front end server (web server).)**.

Art Unit: 2153

39. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow for the capability of to minimize network traffic for determining the best content server.

40. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Joffe et al. (US 6,185,619) as applied to claims 1, 17, and 31 above, and further in view of Lyer et al. (US 7,058,706).

41. In regards to claim 41 Joffe et al. discloses wherein the localization information further comprises performance tests of the networks (**Col. 11 line(s) 57-67 - Col. 12 line(s) 1-23, teach the localization information including performance tests of the networks.**).

42. Joffe et al. do not teach wherein the localization information further comprises triangulation tests and performance tests of the networks.

43. In the same field of endeavor Lyer et al. teach directing a client to the closet server using latency and # of hops (localization information). Likewise Lyer et al. teach using traceroute as triangulation to include the results in a table of localization information (**Col. 3 line(s) 61-67**).

Art Unit: 2153

44. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Joffe et al. method and apparatus for balancing the process load on network servers according to network and server based policies with Iyer et al. teaching as discussed above to allow for the capability of gathering information for directing to the server that is "closest" to the client, based on the localization information collected.

Response to Arguments

45. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to La Juania N. Mouzon whose telephone number is 571-270-3045. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00-5:00, 1st Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2153

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LNM



GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100